

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Atty. Docket: KRUGER=1

In re Application of:)	Conf. No.: 6463
)	
Peter KRUGER et al)	Art Unit: 1793
)	
Appln. No.: 10/588,226)	Examiner: Pegah PARVINI
)	
I.A. Filing Date: 01/25/2005)	Washington, DC
371(c) Date: August 3, 2005)	
)	
For: COSMETIC PREPARATION)	August 25, 2008
CONTAINING A METALIC)	
PIGMENT)	

SUPPLEMENTAL REMARKS

Honorable Commissioner for Patents
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Randolph Building, **Mail Stop: Amendment**
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Sir:

A review of the Reply filed August 21, 2008, reveals some typographical errors in the remarks, which are corrected below. Accordingly, entry of these supplemental remarks for clarification of the record is therefore respectfully requested.

In the first paragraph of the remarks at the top of page 5, in the last line of the third sentence, the last clause should read "the rejections should be withdrawn and the claims allowed."

Appln. No. 10/588,226

Supplemental Remarks dated August 25, 2008

Reply to Office Action dated May 24, 2008

In the first line of the second paragraph on page 6 of the remarks, the word "not" should be changed to "no".

In the second paragraph on page 8, first second, second line, the compound referred to is "silicon dioxide".

On page 9, second paragraph, last sentence, the last clause should read "further coated with a semi-transparent thin metal film to enhance the interference color and its saturation...."

There are two typographical errors in the third paragraph on page 10 of the Reply filed August 21, 2008, so this paragraph (with corrections) is repeated immediately below:

To summarize, even if it would have been obvious to combine the two references which itself is highly questionable for the reasons pointed out above, the only resultant combination could be a metal-effect pigment having interference color with at least two layers. This is clearly contrary to the present claimed invention, which provides for a metallic substrate created only with a single SiO_2 layer having no interference color in a cosmetic preparation.

Appln. No. 10/588,226

Supplemental Remarks dated August 25, 2008

Reply to Office Action dated May 24, 2008

In the top paragraph on page 11 of the Reply of August 21, 2008, second sentence, the first word in line four ("from") should be deleted. And in the same paragraph, last sentence, penultimate line, the word "are" should appear after the word "which".

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.

Attorneys for Applicant

By

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "S. Neimark", written over a horizontal line.

Sheridan Neimark

Registration No. 20,520

SN:jnj

Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197

Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528

G:\BN\L\LOUK\KRUGER1\PTO\2008-8-25SUPPAMD.doc